

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

ACTION PLAN

WHAT	BY WHOM	WHEN
Sub-Committee Action Items		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post Design Subcommittee: One remaining action is to propose additional guidelines to augment the post design section of the Project Development Manual	Berwyn, lead with input from Committee Members	Update on 6/13
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development Partnering Model - Is it working OK? Any changes in order?	L. Peterson E. Gene, R. Hanson	Update on 6/13
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• December Event Planning Committee Continue planning for Dec. 5th; report quarterly	Committee	Update on 6/13
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prepare summary of PEP use in the state for discussion at next meeting	Cynthia Douglas	6/13
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attend next PAC Meeting	All PAC Members	June 13, 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bring refreshments for June 13th PAC meeting	Patricia Ohlerking	June 13, 2007

NEXT PARTNERING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

June 13, 2007, from 9:00-12:00, HRDC

Agenda items for next meeting

- Subcommittee Updates – Annual Event, Post Design Support, Development Model
- Discussion topics – Partnering Evaluation Process – Is it adding value?
- Future Direction for PAC

FUTURE PARTNERING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING DATES:

September 12, 2007 HRDC, 9-Noon

December 5, 2007 Annual Partnering Event – Glendale Civic Center

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Check-in with PAC members re: Stakeholder Group News:

- Tom Goodman, Resident Engineer from Payson – We welcome Tom to the PAC, representing the rural RE's. This is his first meeting.
- Dave Burbank – Materials – their group is in process of rewriting a number of material specifications. Stay tuned for their release.
- Mike Bruder – Development – Lots of new projects in development due to the Program acceleration. They have been challenged getting the people they need for the work.
- Perry Powell – Urban DE – noted the success in making the first AZ Partnering Award presentations at the '06 December Event. The Award Committee learned some lessons from that experience and is making improvements to the process for '07. Information will be forthcoming at the Roads & Streets Conference. They have also been doing some third-party Partnering, e.g., with Dist. Flood Control.
- Bob Webb – TES group (also Light Rail & Dist. Development) – noted challenges they are having getting the light rail group to understand ADOT specifications and buy into the Partnering concepts.
- Adam Carreon – EIT, Partnering Office – has assisted Partnering Office for 6 months and is serving as a Partnering facilitator for small projects.
- Chris Cooper – Roadway Group – We welcome Chris to the PAC from Development. He also noted the heavy workload of new projects coming down the road.
- Mark Soyster – Pulice Construction – After a lull in jobs going out for bid, the action is again picking up. Their current projects are going well.
- Will Garrison – FNF Construction – Agreed the lull is over, and that is good. Noted that FNF's Jedd Billings is preparing for retirement and has turned the Presidency over to Matt Gully. He anticipates there will be some significant materials challenges when the new workload hits, particularly with items like steel, girders, etc.
- Rene Redondo – Granite Construction – announced this will be his last meeting, as he retires on May 1. Given Granite's experiences in other states, Rene believes ADOT still has the best Partnering template going. He also noted that Pima County is coming on board with the Partnering process.
- Patricia Ohlerking – Right-of-Way – We welcome Patricia to the PAC. She comes to ADOT from another state where she was involved in the Partnering process. Now, she has asked to become a member of this group to support ADOT's process.
- Linda Peterson – Partnering Office – She had been working with Urso Penalosa on evaluating the Development Partnering processes, but with his departure from the PAC, is now working with Ermalinda Gene to complete the analysis. She noted wanting to involve the Environmental and ROW Groups more in the development Partnering activities.
- Layne Patton – FHWA – discussed 6 Partnering-related activities FHWA has been involved with recently –
 - A FHWA/ADOT/Tonto Natl. Forest partnership to build stronger relations among the members and agree on joint working practices

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

- FHWA and ADOT have had a partnership for several years, but it has not been updated in four years, so is due for a refresher.
 - FHWA is getting more involved in seeing how it can assist with Tribal issues in the state, both with individual tribes and collectively.
 - They are working to improve coordination between regional traffic center operations – e.g. city-to-city signal coordination
 - They are conducting a joint risk assessment of program efficiency in order to see how they can better meet the needs of the agencies they work with
 - They have conducted 8 ROW workshops around the state to aid in understanding and meeting compliance requirements. Currently working to do a similar workshop with the City of Phoenix. They are also preparing a course on Appraisal and Review, which should be ready for delivery in January.
- Cynthia Douglas – Partnering Office, PEP support – Is working to market the PEP program and assist users in understanding and using its capabilities to a fuller extent. She is hoping to get greater usage web-based data input and report generation.
- James Young – Partnering Office – Acting Director – had several items of note:
 - Many new public partnerships underway between ADOT and other agencies – Navajo/BIA, Cities of Mesa & Tempe: Forest Service, and regional Partnering (e.g., in SE Arizona with Benson, Bisbee, Douglas, & Cochise County)
 - Upcoming talks with the Hopi Tribe, Pinal County, City of Glendale
 - New Partnering Class updates are being developed (see later agenda item)
 - The concept of District Partnering Champions is being pursued (see later agenda item)
 - New Partnering Consultant contract – several new consultants that do not have construction experience will be used for public partnerships
 - The Partnering Specification is being updated – will make Partnering mandatory. AGC is supporting this change and will be developing/requiring basic Partnering training for its members
 - Raising awareness of highway safety – 18 member organizations on Governor's Traffic Safety Advisory Council – facilitated by Partnering Office – also involved in a ADOT/FHWA Safety Working Group to help get ADOT's Strategic Highway Safety Plan developed/submitted before October
- Roxanne Lopez – Office Manager – their group is completing a rewrite of the Administrative Procedures book. Noted that the communication and coordination between the Org. offices and the Partnering Office is getting better for scheduling workshops.
- Kevin Woudenberg – United Rentals - Subcontractor – noted a challenge Traffic Control subcontractors are having with conflicting standards for construction jobs vs. landscape projects.
- Russ Hanson – representing Contract Partnering Consultants – The new consultant contract is now being used, with the biggest change being no built-in project follow-up. Each project team determines the need for and frequency of follow-up

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

Annual Partnering Event –

December 6, 2006 - Recap

James Young provided a review of the 2006 Annual Partnering Event held at the Mesa Convention Center on December 6th. Some feedback highlights includes:

- Appreciation for the longer breaks to network with colleagues
- The breakout presentations from successful project Partnering experiences
- The new Arizona Partnering Award presentations
- Sharing of Utah's experience with Partnering
- Very well organized and well-run.

A more complete report may be found in the Attachment

December 5, 2007 Planning

Preparations are already underway for this year's Event. It will be held at the Glendale Civic Center and have a theme along the lines of "Partnering: The Superbowl of Teamwork" to coincide with Superbowl XVIII to be held in Glendale the following month.

Subcommittee planning meetings are scheduled monthly to work out all the details. See Attachment for additional information.

Farewell to Rene Redondo

James Young presented Rene Redondo, Granite Construction, a certificate and book to recognize his many years of service to the Partnering Advisory Committee. Granite has won a number of Marvin M. Black Partnering Awards, and Rene has led the way as a contractor Champion of Partnering since its inception at ADOT. He retires on May 1st and we will miss his participation and contribution to the Committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE:

Post Design Support

Berwyn Wilbrink was unable to attend today's meeting, but reported in advance that the action item to incorporate additional post design support guidelines in the Project Development Manual is still on-going. We will keep this item open for now.

Design Partnering Model

With Urso Penalosa resigning from the PAC, this subgroup lost a bit of traction. Linda Peterson and Ermalinda Gene from the Partnering Office are working to get it back on track and develop the structures and processes for effective Partnering at the design/development stage. The

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

current process has been used for several years, and the intent is to evaluate how it is working and what, if any, changes need to be made.

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

E-Learning – Intro to Partnering

Bonnie Opie and Steve Clarke are revamping the Intro to Partnering Class to make more effective use of people's time. Bonnie presented the key features of the new version. To eliminate the boredom of the lecture material in the live class, it will be made available on line so students can individually read the material and take written quizzes for comprehension. Once the e-learning portion is successfully completed, the student will then attend a 2-hour "mock" Partnering workshop with a group of other students. Role plays will be used to enliven the discussion and make the learning more effective. Both portions of the course must be completed for class credit. Anticipated completion of the new version is June.

PAC Membership

We continue to fine tune the membership of the PAC. We have several new members to replace those who have left or are not actively participating, and we still need your support in filling vacancies and encouraging broader participation. We had some discussion about inviting certain utility representatives and members from other agencies such as cities and counties.

See also, the later discussion about future agendas to keep the interest level up and the meetings value-added for the members.

District Partnering Champions

James Young introduced a proposed plan to identify District Partnering Champions to help promote the use of Partnering processes throughout their respective District. A Roles and Responsibilities description was distributed, which generated a number of questions among the members. It appeared to many that the Champion role was being created to serve a number of needs:

- fill a potential void in Partnering leadership – assure Partnering is being used and supported
- assist the Partnering Office in workshop coordination
- monitor the use of PEP among District projects to identify issues and participation levels

The multiple roles seemed to cause confusion among the PAC members as to what problem(s) was trying to be solved, and if a District Champion was the best solution. No conclusions were reached, but the Partnering Office now has some feedback to consider if/when it rolls out the process.

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

A Champion Card was also introduced, similar to the Issue Resolution Card currently being used. It is intended as a reminder to the people selected as *project* Partnering Champions of their roles and responsibilities. Note, not to be confused with the role of the District Champion.

Both these documents are included as Attachments.

FUTURE TOPICS FOR PAC DISCUSSION

The above discussion about Champions and use (or lack thereof) of PEP, led to a broader discussion at the end of the meeting about the current role of the Partnering Advisory Committee itself and what it should *actually be doing* these days. When it was originally formed many years ago, ADOT was just developing its Partnering processes and supporting structures. Now that those have been pretty well established, what overarching role does the PAC serve and how do we keep the meetings productive and value-added? This question (and the seeming lack of a clear answer) may be one of the reasons PAC participation has fallen off over the past couple of years. Could the major “business” activities of the PAC be done differently (e.g., the Annual Event Planning, the review of the Partnering Fine-Tuned Processes, etc.)?

Much of the agenda today was taken up with “information sharing” activities. What became of the “steering committee” strategic direction role of the PAC? These are important questions that must be addressed to define the future role of the PAC and how best to use our time together. This will be topic of off-line discussion prior to the June meeting, and possible a topic for the PAC itself in June.

The other hot-button item that came up today was the use of PEP. Why aren’t people using the web-based features? Is the PEP being used by projects the way it is intended? If not, why not? At the next meeting, Cynthia Douglas will give us some “facts” about PEP and the PAC will tackle some of these questions.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Partnering Advisory Committee (PAC) Membership Roster
- 2006 Annual Event Wrap Up and 2007 Planning Notes
- District Partnering Champion – Draft Roles and Responsibilities
- Champion Card - Draft

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

MEETING FEEDBACK

Note: ✓ means multiple entries of same comment

MOST VALUABLE:

- Hearing others' presentations and concerns ✓
- Meeting new members and various groups' updates ✓
- A very good, open, and honest exchange of ideas
- Seeing the recognition of the team
- Meeting more key people who value and support the Partnering process
- Networking ✓
- This was my first meeting. I'm familiar with the process on construction projects, but this meeting opened my eyes to the bigger picture. There is a lot to think about for the next meeting.
- Hearing from new members; discussion of the District Champion scenario; discussion on PEP value, outcomes, accountability
- To hear the honest feedback about the PAC and its purpose. Contractor opinions are most valuable
- My first meeting, so everything was helpful in terms of developing the context for me

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE:

- Continue as we are
- Nothing, good format and good participation
- More participation & more focus on core/root issues ✓
- Focus on keeping it short and sweet, with priorities for upper management, and get more higher-up ADOT members to attend ✓
- Facilitator leading group "timekeeping" to keep on schedule
- More attendance ✓
- Get utility companies to participate
- Less discussion on internal operation issues – more identification of critical or strategic issues appropriate to an advisory committee – identifying or re-affirmation of the role of PAC

OVERALL RATING OF THE MEETING:

1	2	3	4	Average 3.25
	1	7	4	

(Scale: 1=Needs Significant Improvement, 4=Excellent, met all expectations)

COMMENTS:

- It was great to see representatives from the construction industry value Partnering so much
- Enjoyed my participation on the committee

Partnering Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: March 14, 2007

Location: HRDC – Grand Canyon #2

- Agree with the team that the meeting should be more proactive about making the time well-spent.
- Hopefully, Partnering can help resolve the problem for the traffic safety industry by changing the specs for recognizing traffic control devices similar to construction, involving the landscaping projects.
- I think the contractor's comments about the lack of participation by ADOT staff needs to be addressed
- Identifying the agenda for the June meeting was a positive outcome. Hopefully more ADOT participation will be encouraged.

For questions, assistance & information, please refer to the ADOT Partnering web site:

<http://www.azdot.gov/CCPartnerships/Partnering/index.asp>